

provision of not more than \$15,000,000, in the aggregate, to all foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organizations with respect to which such authority is exercised.

(4) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Upon exercising the authority provided in paragraph (1), the President shall report in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GREENWOOD:

Strike section 587 of the bill (page 124, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 15 on page 127).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to share one-half the time allotted to my amendment with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York will control 15 minutes, and may yield time to other Members.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the 30 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey will control 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood-Lowe amendment, for the following reasons. Family planning reduces abortion, it is just that simple. People who go to receive advice on family planning oftentimes go first because they believe that they may be pregnant, and if you say that you may not offer abortion services, you are cutting a substantial amount out of the value of family planning because of the opportunity that people seek to get that advice.

Secondly, this particular provision in the bill prohibits even advocating for a change in the law. Indeed, the way it is written it even prohibits advocating a change in the law to outlaw abortion. Anybody who lobbies their own government in order to affect abortion no longer qualifies for assistance under the bill.

Third and last, this provision is an absolute prohibition on family plan-

ning, and it has a waiver, and this year the waiver was acceptable to me because the President would exercise that waiver. But particularly for pro-choice Republicans, of whom I am one and my colleague from Pennsylvania is another, we do not know who will be President next year, and if our candidate for President is the President next year, which is my desire, I have no assurance that he will exercise the waiver.

So let me repeat that to pro-choice Republicans: We have no guarantee that this waiver, which we were willing to accept last year as a compromise, will in fact be exercised should it be the Republican candidate for President elected. Accordingly, the law would stand, and the law is no money for family planning, because the groups in question cannot make the certification. We are voting today on Greenwood to restore family planning. It is that important, that simple, and that clear.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would strike the global gag rule from this bill. This anti-democratic policy forces NGOs in the developing world to sacrifice their right to free speech in order to participate in our family planning programs. While restricting foreign NGOs in this way may only offend our democratic sensibilities, if we tried to do this at home, it would be absolutely unconstitutional.

Section 587 of this bill severely damages our international family planning programs. The demand for these programs is much larger than our limited funds can meet, and section 587 imposes an arbitrary cap on family planning which is \$156 million below the President's request.

Very simply, our family planning programs save lives. 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes that are often preventable. More than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives, but have no access to them. Increasing access to family planning will save the lives of women and children and it will reduce the incidence of abortion worldwide. Striking this section will reduce the number of abortions performed each day. If you support this objective, you should support this amendment.

We need to consider the global gag rule within the overall context of U.S. foreign policy. What values do we want to export along with our foreign assistance? The gag rule says to our NGO partners abroad that we do not need to care about their rights, that freedom of speech, the very foundation of the American democracy, matters here, but it does not matter abroad, that our commitment to free speech and freedom of association, fixtures of our Constitution, end at our own borders. Is this the kind of message that we want to send?

Make no mistake, the United States is being watched. Each day Members on

both sides of the aisle condemn violations of human rights abroad. Each day we debate whether the United States should associate at all with foreign regimes who refuse to embrace Democratic ideals. Our neighbors around the world look to us as the definitive authority on democracy.

The words of the director of a family planning organization that receives our funding sums up the severe damage that we do to our own credibility by incorporating an anti-democratic policy such as the gag rule into our foreign assistance program:

We believe this requirement is profoundly anti-democratic and does a disservice to the legacy of the United States of America's fight for democracy. Democracy is nourished and strengthened by open debate and freedom of expression. Shackling the discussion of ideas impoverishes such public debate, and, in doing so, weakens democracy. We are now in the difficult position of having to choose between needed funding for an historic project on the one hand and essential democratic participation on the other. Either way, there is a cost to women's reproductive health and to democracy.

Mr. Chairman, if the oppression of ideas with which some do not agree and the use of economic power to crush dissent are ideals one thinks the United States should export, then vote against this amendment. But if believes, as I do, that the strength of our country lies in our unwavering commitment to democracy at home and abroad, then join us in voting yes to strike the global gag rule.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 3½ minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly going to be an abortion debate. Others can try to turn it into recycling the old phrase about the gag rule, but this fundamentally an abortion debate, and whether those of us who strongly believe that abortion is taking the life of innocent children should have to pay, and in this question it is not for abortions in our country, but abortions overseas, whether we are going to export this doctrine of death.

I have worked hard in this Congress to fight against child abuse, to fight against domestic violence, to work for creative ways to stop violence in our schools. But it is hard to take a message to our young people that it is wrong to kill other young people, it is wrong to beat children, but if the child is in the womb, you can burn their skin off, you can cut them off, you can take the baby as they are coming out and hit them with a blunt object. Now, that is another form of violence.